



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/963,292	09/25/2001	David Gok Louie	SBL0016US	9643		
60975	7590	04/30/2008	EXAMINER			
CAMPBELL STEPHENSON LLP	WON, MICHAEL YOUNG					
11401 CENTURY OAKS TERRACE	ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER			
BLDG. H, SUITE 250	2155					
AUSTIN, TX 78758	MAIL DATE					
	04/30/2008					
	DELIVERY MODE					
	PAPER					

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/963,292	LOUIE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	MICHAEL Y. WON	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2008.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-16, 18-36, 38 and 39 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-16, 18-36, 38 and 39 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
     1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
     2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
     3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                      |                                                                   |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.                                                         | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed March 31, 2008.
2. Claims 1, 12, 14, 24, and 38 have been amended and new claim 39 has been added.
3. Claims 1-16, 18-36, 38, and 39 have been examined and are pending with this action.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-16, 18-36, 38, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kao et al. (US 6,070,177) in view of Wong (US 7,127,448).

### **INDEPENDENT:**

As per **claim 1**, Kao teaches an apparatus comprising an application program (see col.3, line 67-col.4, line 3: “network client runs a ‘web browser’, which is simply an application program for accessing and providing...”) comprising:

one or more business components, wherein a business component comprises one or more fields, wherein the fields correspond to records in a database, and the database is separate from the application program (see Fig.3; col.1, lines 34-36: “database forms are often created to present the data corresponding to a specific activity”; and col.3, lines 14-15: “request and receive documents or database files comprising data or object descriptors”),

means for selecting for auditing a business component from the one or more business components (see col.10, lines 8-13: “creating an audit trail for a database form or document that is transmitted among users... a user selects a database form to use for a particular request”),

means for selecting for auditing one or more selected operations of a plurality of operations, wherein the operations are configured to operate on the selected business component (see col.5, lines 4-7: “consists of a number of fixed fields that indicate the type of data or information to be entered” and col.7, line 22-39),

means for creating an audit trail for the application program (see col.4, lines 58-62: “stores data created for that program” and col.5, lines 51-56: “information relating to each user is appended to the audit trail”), and

means for providing the audit trail to the database associated with the fields of the business component (see col.4, lines 58-67: “Various types of data relating to different activities can be stored in a network server 104 by the database application”).

Kao does not explicitly teach that the means for selecting for auditing one or more selected operations is further configured to exclude one or more operations of the plurality of operations from auditing.

Wong teaches means for selecting for auditing one or more selected operations is further configured to exclude one or more operations of the plurality of operations from auditing (see col.8, lines 20-30: “creating audit records only for selected rows in the relational database that are accessed by the database operation and that satisfy the auditing condition”).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Kao in view of Wong so that means for selecting for auditing one or more selected operations is further configured to exclude one or more operations of the plurality of operations from auditing. One would be motivated to do so because such means saves processing time and power by only auditing requested operations and because such step is subjective.

As per **claim 14**, Kao teaches a system comprising:  
a processor (see col.3, lines 15-20: “CPU”); and  
a memory coupled to the processor and storing  
a first set of instructions, executable by the processor (see col.3, lines 26-28: “loaded into memory”), configured to provide a business component wherein the business component comprises one or more field, wherein the fields correspond to records in a database, and the database is separate from the application program (see

Fig.3; col.1, lines 34-36: "database forms are often created to present the data corresponding to a specific activity"; and col.3, lines 14-15: "request and receive documents or database files comprising data or object descriptors"),

a second set of instructions (see col.3, lines 26-28: "instructions"), executable by the processor, configured to provide user interface (see col.3, line 67-col.4, line 3: "web browser"), wherein the user interface is configured to allow selection for auditing of a selected field of the one or more fields and one or more selected operations on the selected fields (see col.10, lines 8-13: "creating an audit trail for a database form or document that is transmitted among users... a user selects a database form to use for a particular request"),

a third set of instructions (see col.3, lines 26-28: "instructions"), executable by the processor, configured to detect when the selected operations are performed on the selected fields (see col.6, lines 46-51: "automatically entered by the client computer or server computer upon a specific event"),

a fourth set of instructions (see col.3, lines 26-28: "instructions"), executable by the processor, configured to generate an audit transaction record regarding the selected field when the selected operations are detected (see col.9, lines 21-24: "data in the audit trail can only be added or modified by specific actions related to the transmission of the request"), and

a fifth set of instructions (see col.3, lines 26-28: "instructions"), executable by the processor, configured to provide the audit transaction record to the database associated with the fields of the business component (see col.4, lines 58-67: "Various types of data

relating to different activities can be stored in a network server 104 by the database application").

Kao does not explicitly teach user interface further configured to allow selection for excluding from auditing one or more selected operations.

Wong teaches user interface further configured to allow selection for excluding from auditing one or more selected operations (see col.8, lines 20-30: "creating audit records only for selected rows in the relational database that are accessed by the database operation and that satisfy the auditing condition").

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Kao in view of Wong by implementing user interface further configured to allow selection for excluding from auditing one or more selected operations. One would be motivated to do so because such means saves processing time and power by only auditing requested operations and because such step is subjective.

As per **claim 24**, Kao teaches a method comprising:

auditing an application program wherein said auditing comprises creating an audit trail (see col.4, lines 58-62: "stores data created for that program" and col.5, lines 51-56: "information relating to each user is appended to the audit trail");

using the application program (see col.3, line 67-col.4, line 3: "network client runs a 'web browser', which is simply an application program for accessing and providing...")

to perform audit trail functions (see col.2, lines 63-64: "associating an audit trail with a database form is disclosed") comprising:

generating a list of business components included in the application program, wherein a business component of the list of business components comprises one or more fields, wherein the fields correspond to records in a database, and the database is separate from the application program (see Fig.3; col.1, lines 34-36: "database forms are often created to present the data corresponding to a specific activity"; and col.3, lines 14-15: "request and receive documents or database files comprising data or object descriptors"),

presenting the list of business components to a user (see Fig.3 and Fig.4);

allowing the user to select for auditing a selected business component (see col.10, lines 8-13: "creating an audit trail for a database form or document that is transmitted among users... a user selects a database form to use for a particular request");

presenting the list of operations that can be performed on the selected business component to the user (see Fig.4 and Fig.5);

allowing the user to select for auditing one or more selected operations for the selected business component (see col.5, lines 4-7: "consists of a number of fixed fields that indicate the type of data or information to be entered" and col.7, line 22-39), and

providing the audit trail to the database associated with the fields of the business component (see col.4, lines 58-67: "Various types of data relating to different activities can be stored in a network server 104 by the database application").

Kao does not explicitly teach allowing the user to exclude from auditing one or more selected operations for the selected business component.

Wong teaches allowing the user to exclude from auditing one or more selected operations for the selected business component (see col.8, lines 20-30: “creating audit records only for selected rows in the relational database that are accessed by the database operation and that satisfy the auditing condition”).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Kao in view of Wong by implementing allowing the user to exclude from auditing one or more selected operations for the selected business component. One would be motivated to do so because such means saves processing time and power by only auditing requested operations and because such step is subjective.

#### **DEPENDENT:**

As per **claim 2**, which depends on claim 1, Kao further teaches wherein the application program further comprises: means for detecting when the selected operations are performed (see col.6, lines 46-51: “automatically entered by the client computer or server computer upon a specific event”).

As per **claim 3**, which depends on claim 2, Kao further teaches wherein the application program further comprises: means for generating an audit transaction record regarding the business component when the selected operations are detected (see col.5, lines 51-56: “information relating to each user is appended to the audit trail”).

As per **claim 4, 15, and 25**, which depend on claims 1, 14, and 24, respectively, Kao further teaches wherein the selected or list of operations to be audited include at least one of: update, add, copy, and delete (see col.5, lines 11-13: "modify the data within the form").

As per **claim 5, 16, and 26**, which depend on claims 1, 14, and 24, respectively, Kao teaches of further comprising means for allowing the user to restrict access to the audit trail by at least one of: an employee identifier, an employment position, and an area of responsibility (see col.5, lines 29-33: "authorized to make changes"; col.6, lines 19-22; and col.7, lines 42-44: "employee to a supervisor or personnel department").

As per **claim 6 and 28**, which depend on claims 3, 14, and 27, respectively, Kao does not explicitly teach of further comprising means for storing the audit transaction record in an external database.

Wong teaches storing the audit transaction record in an external database (see Fig.1 and col.2, lines 9-10: "The system records the audit record in an audit record store").

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Kao in view of Wong by implementing storing the audit transaction record in an external database. One would be motivated to do so because Kao teaches that the network of the invention comprises the World Wide Web, which clearly consists of internal and external databases, and because the storage locale of any data is subjective.

As per **claims 7, 18, and 29**, which depend on claims 3, 14, and 27, respectively, Kao teaches of further comprising means for storing the audit transaction record in a file (see col.4, lines 47-50: “that create and store files and data”).

As per **claims 8, 19, and 30**, which depend on claims 7, 18, and 29, respectively, Kao further teaches wherein the means for providing the audit trail comprises means for importing the audit transaction record stored in the file to the database (see col.4, lines 58-67: “The data can be entered into the server computer directly or into a client computer coupled to the server over a network”).

As per **claims 9, 20, and 31**, which depend on claims 3, 14, and 27, respectively, Kao further teaches wherein the audit transaction record includes at least one of: an identifier for the entity that accessed the business component or the field, the operation that was performed on the business component, when the operation was performed, a previous value of the field, a current value of the field, and how the value of at least a portion of the business component was changed (see col.5, lines 40-44: “lists such information as the name or ID of the user who created the form, the names or ID’s of each of the users who received the form, the data and time of reception, any action taken by each user, and other such information”).

As per **claims 10, 21, and 32**, which depend on claims 3, 14, and 27, respectively, Kao teaches of further comprising means for allowing the user to query one or more of the audit transaction records (see col.5, lines 40-48: “provides a means by which the transmission history and actions taken regarding a particular document, set of data, or database form may be viewed by the users of the document or form”).

As per **claims 11, 23, and 33**, which depend on claim 2, 14, and 27, respectively, Kao teaches of further comprising means for prompting the user to enter a comment or a description of the operation when the selected operations are detected (see col.6, lines 53-56: “Other fields in the audit trail may be text entry fields that allow a user to type information directly into the audit trail”).

As per **claims 12 and 34**, which depend on claims 1 and 24, respectively, Kao further teaches wherein the one or more selected business components comprise a plurality of fields, and further comprising: means for selecting a selected filed of the plurality of fields to be audited (see col.7, lines 22-24: “make changes or revisions to the contents of a form”; and col.10, lines 8-13: “a user selects a database form to use for a particular request”), wherein the means for selecting a selected filed is further configured to exclude one or more fields of the plurality of fields from auditing (see claim 1 and 24 rejections above); and means for generating an audit transaction record when one of the selected operations on one of the selected fields is detected (see col.6, lines 46-51: “automatically entered by the client computer or server computer upon a specific event”).

As per **claims 13, 22 and 35**, which depend on claims 1, 14, and 34, respectively, Kao teaches of further comprising means for allowing the user to restore the one or more of the fields to a previous state or value (see col.8, lines 48-55: “return the request back”).

As per **claim 27**, which depend on claim 24, Kao teaches of further comprising: detecting when the selected operations are performed on one of the selected business

components (see col.6, lines 46-51: “automatically entered by the client computer or server computer upon a specific event”); and generating an audit transaction record when the selected operations are detected (see col.9, lines 21-24: “data in the audit trail can only be added or modified by specific actions related to the transmission of the request”).

As per **claim 36**, which depend on claim 24, Kao further teach of a computer-readable storage medium comprising: instructions for implementing the method of claim 24 (see col.3, lines 26-50: “instructions”).

As per **claim 38**, which depends on claim 1, Kao further teaches wherein the application further comprises means for selecting the audit trail, where the audit trail is configured to be selected repetitively; means for enabling the audit trail, subsequent to selecting the audit trail, where the audit trail is configured to be enabled repetitively; and means for disabling the audit trail, subsequent to selecting the audit trail, where the audit trail is configured to be disabled repetitively (implicit: see col.6, lines 46-64).

As per **claim 39**, which depends on claim 1, Kao does not explicitly teach the business component comprises a table which includes information for item, person, or other entity.

Wong teaches comprising a table (see col.2, lines 7-9).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Kao in view of Wong so that business component comprises a table. One would be motivated to do so because such limitation is subjective to merely suggest a display preference.

Kao and Wong do not explicitly teach that the table includes information for item, person, or other entity.

However these differences are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited. The display of a table will be presented regardless of the data. Thus this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ and heading within the business component table because such data does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the data does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16, 18-36, 38, and 39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant(s) seem to be asserting somehow selected data to be audited somehow includes not selected data and therefore all data is inherently audited. The applicant(s) also seem to be asserting that because the invention allows for selection or de-selection via a user interface (i.e. window or browser) that somehow this is a novel feature of the invention. One of ordinary skill in the art would conclude that when a prior

art teaches a selection of a particular data to be audited, such prior art means of selection /de-selection would also incorporate well-known prior art methods of selection such as checking a box, highlighting, pull-down menu (see Kao: col.6, line 57), ect. To expedite prosecution, the applicant(s) are suggested to clearly and explicitly recite the functional limitations of the system rather than relying on the method of use or subjective limitations.

### ***Conclusion***

6. For the reasons above, claims 1-16, 18-36, 38, and 39 have been rejected and remain pending.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL Y. WON whose telephone number is (571)272-3993. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th: 10AM-8PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on 571-272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael Won/

Primary Examiner

April 25, 2008